

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/895,381 | 07/02/2001 | Douglas C. Stahl | 2703.2 | 1421 | |
| 5514 | 7590 01/21/2005 | | EXAMINER | | |
| | RICK CELLA HARPE | CLOW, LORI A | | | |
| 30 ROCKE | FELLER PLAZA | | L nm to um | n . nem | |
| NEW YOR | K, NY 10112 | | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | | 1631 | | |
| | | DATEMAN ED 01/21/2005 | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/895,381 | STAHL, DOUGLAS | C. | | |
| navioury notion | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Lori A. Cłow, Ph.D. | 1631 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | iress | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 6 Januray 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data | isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI | f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. | See MPEP | | |
| have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three molearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in | fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or | tension fee under (2) as set forth in | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | | | |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection | ction(s): See Continuation Shee | <u>l</u> . | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a s | separate, timely file | d amendment | | |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See | or reconsideration has been consecutions | sidered but does No | OT place the | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | cause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which we | ere newly | | |
| 7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w | t(s) a) will not be entered or bould be rejected is provided bel | o)⊠ will be entered ow or appended. | and an | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1,3,5-13,15,17-25,27,29-37,39 an | <u>d 41-48</u> . | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app | proved or b) disapproved by | the Examiner. | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme | ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | · | | | |
| 10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Applicant has clarified that the data comes from the amplification of nucleic acids such that identification of alleles is attained.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claims, as written, are not enabled for distinguishing alleles from background using the recited steps.

Continuation of 10. Other: The Examiner appreciates Applicants attempt to overcome the outstanding 112, 1st paragraph rejections set forth in the previous Office Action. However, the rejection has not been fully overcome because it remains unclear exactly what nucliec acids are being amplified and therefore, the claims are not enabled. As previously set forth and as also recited in the prior art, it must be clear that the nucleic acids of interest have a correlation to a polymorphic region. In effort to guide Applicant for appropriate language concerning the nature of the nucleic acid, the Examiner again points to the specification at pages 13-14 which provide anablement for "amplyfying alleles that exist in specific microsatellite marker locations of interest. The polymorphic markers are selected for determining genotype. Primers are designed to amplify the alleles of each marker". Again, the claims are now drawn to the amplification of nucleic acids, but the problem lies in the nature of the nucleic acid. Applicant is again reminded that the specification is enabling for the amplification of polymorphic DNA.

Jon A Clay, Ph.D. 1/19/05

Mayory a - Noron